

Application Serial No.: 10/799,503  
Attorney Docket No.: 0160113

### REMARKS

This is in response to the *Non-Final* Office Action of November 12, 2008, where the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 24-28 and 30-45. By the present amendment, applicant has amended claims 1, 12, 22 and 28, and added new claims 46-47. After the present amendment, claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 24-28 and 30-47 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of outstanding claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 24-28 and 30-47 in view of the following remarks are requested.

A. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-20, 22, 24-26, 28, 30-32 and 34-45 under 35 USC §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-20, 22, 24-26, 28, 30-32 and 34-45, under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by Kroon (USPN 5,664,055) ("Kroon").

By the present amendment, applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite "creating a plurality of voicing indexes by said encoder, wherein each of said plurality of voicing indexes is derived from a normalized pitch correlation parameter  $R_p$ , where  $-1.0 < R_p < 1.0$ , and each of said plurality of voicing indexes is indicative of one of a plurality of classes of said input speech signal ...." Applicant respectfully submits that Kroon fails to disclose, teach or suggest such limitations.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action still fails to show that the encoder of Kroon does transmit a voicing index indicative of one of a plurality of classes of said input speech signal, wherein each of said plurality of classes of said input speech signal represents a different degree of periodicity of said input speech signal. Rather, the Office Action

Application Serial No.: 10/799,503  
Attorney Docket No.: 0160113

acknowledges this lack of disclosure in Kroon, but states that “The same method used to encode is usually just reversed in order to decode.” (Office Action, Page 2) (emphasis added.) Clearly, in the case of Kroon, the decoder of Kroon performs calculations for classifying the speech signal, and based on the Examiner’s statement, Kroon’s encoder must not transmit the speech classification, as recited in claim 1, or Kroon’s decoder would simply use the classification information provided by the encoder and would not perform calculations for classifying the speech signal.

To be clear, applicant is not even arguing that the encoder of Kroon does not determine the degree of periodicity of the speech signal-- as this is not even the issue. Rather, applicant respectfully submits that the encoder of Kroon does not transmit a voicing index indicative of one of a plurality of classes of said input speech signal, wherein each of said plurality of classes of said input speech signal represents a different degree of periodicity of said input speech signal.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not properly differentiate between the transmission of a “speech classification index” by an encoder to a decoder, on one hand, and the transmission of speech parameters, on the other hand, where such speech parameters must be used by the decoder to perform calculations for classifying the speech signal. Applicant respectfully submits that a key distinction between claim 1 of the present application and Kroon is that the transmission of the speech classification index eliminates the need for using speech parameters by the decoder to classify the speech signal, and the decoder may simply use the result of encoder classification, as indicated by the voicing index. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no single parameter in Kroon that is transmitted by the encoder that can, standing alone, inform the decoder of frame classifications designated by a background noise

Application Serial No.: 10/799,503  
Attorney Docket No.: 0160113

class, an unvoiced class, a first voiced class, a second voiced class, wherein said first voiced class has a lower degree of periodicity than said second voiced class.

At col. 30, lines 55-65, Kroon discusses the concealment of frame erasures and parity errors, and states that “If the last correctly received frame was classified as periodic, the current frame is considered to be periodic as well.” However, contrary to the Examiner’s conclusion that this statement indicates that the received frame from the encoder includes a “classification” to show that it is periodic; col. 30, lines 1-18 of Kroon, as quoted below, clearly shows that the classification is determined at the decoder. It is respectfully submitted that if the received frame from the encoder, in Kroon, did include a classification index, as alleged by the Examiner, there would be no need for the decoder of Kroon to perform classification, as described at col. 30, lines 1-18:

The concealment strategy has to reconstruct the current frame, based on previously received information. The method used replaces the missing excitation signal with one of similar characteristics, while gradually decaying its energy. This is done by using a voicing classifier based on the long-term prediction gain, which is computed as part of the long-term postfilter analysis. The pitch postfilter (see Subsection II.4.2.1) finds the long-term predictor for which the prediction gain is more than 3 dB. This is done by setting a threshold of 0.5 on the normalized correlation  $R'(k)$  (Eq. (81)). For the error concealment process, these frames will be classified as periodic. Otherwise the frame is declared nonperiodic. An erased frame inherits its class from the preceding (reconstructed) speech frame. Note that the voicing classification is continuously updated based on this reconstructed speech signal. Hence, for many consecutive erased frames the classification might change. Typically, this only happens if the original classification was periodic. (emphasis added.)

The Examiner should note that Section 4 of Kroon describes “Functional Description of the Decoder,” and Section 4.2.1 describes “Pitch Posfilter” for the decoder of Kroon. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the decoder of Kroon classifies the speech signal, and the

Application Serial No.: 10/799,503  
Attorney Docket No.: 0160113

disclosure at col. 30, 55-65, which has been relied upon by the Examiner to reject claim 1, as amended, in fact, teaches away from the invention of claim 1 by showing that the decoder classification is not based on a classification index received from the encoder.

Also, the Examiner has relied upon the disclosure at col. 30, 55-65, in Kroon, which shows that the decoder performs the classification, and the error concealment section of Kroon does not use a classification index from the encoder, but the error concealment section of Kroon uses the classification information derived in Subsection II.4.2.1 of the decoder in Kroon. Therefore, Kroon fails to disclose, teach or suggest that its encoder transmits a voicing indexes that is indicative of one of a plurality of classes, where the classes of the input speech signal indicated by the voicing index include a background noise class, an unvoiced class, a first voiced class, a second voiced class, wherein said first voiced class has a lower degree of periodicity than said second voiced class.

It is respectfully submitted that the final Office Action merely cites “(index; column 1, lines 22-26, col. 3, lines 17-25, and column 30, lines 55-65),” next to the limitations “creating a plurality of voicing indexes by said encoder, wherein each of said plurality of voicing indexes is indicative of one of a plurality of classes of said input speech signal, wherein each of said plurality of classes of said input speech signal represents a different degree of periodicity of said input speech signal.” Applicant respectfully submits that the “index” referenced at column 1, lines 43-64 of Kroon is simply an index to the fixed codebook, and not for providing speech classification information, including a background noise class, an unvoiced class, a first voiced class, a second voiced class, wherein said first voiced class has a lower degree of periodicity than

Application Serial No.: 10/799,503  
Attorney Docket No.: 0160113

said second voiced class. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the “index” referenced in Kroon.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Kroon. In addition, independent claims 12, 22 and 28 include limitations similar to those of claim 1, as amended, and should be allowed for the same reasons stated above. Further, claims 3-10, 14-20, 24-26, 30-32 and 34-45 depend from claims 1, 12, 22 and 28, respectively, and should be allowed at least for the reasons stated above.

**B. Rejection of Claims 11, 21, 27 and 33 under 35 USC §103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 11, 21, 27 and 33, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Kroon in view of Morii, et al. (PGPUB 2006/0206317) (“Morii”).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11, 21, 27 and 33 depend from claims 1, 12, 22 and 28, respectively, and should be allowed at least for the reasons stated above.

**C. New Claims 46-47**

By the present amendment, applicant has added claim 46, which depends from claim 1 and recites “wherein said plurality of voicing indexes are used in place of pitch gain for post pitch enhancement.” Applicant respectfully submits that cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 46.

By the present amendment, applicant has also added claim 47, which depends from claim 5 and recites “wherein said plurality of voicing indexes are used to control a modification to a

Application Serial No.: 10/799,503  
Attorney Docket No.: 0160113


low pass filter for said Sinc window." Applicant respectfully submits that cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of claim 47.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
NOV 18 2008

**D. Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing reasons, an early Notice of Allowance directed to all claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 24-28 and 30-47 pending in the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,  
FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP



Farshad Farjami, Esq.  
Reg. No. 41,014

FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP  
26522 La Alameda Ave., Suite 360  
Mission Viejo, California 92691  
Telephone: (949) 282-1000  
Facsimile: (949) 282-1002

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed by facsimile transmission to United States Patent and Trademark Office at facsimile number (571) 273-8300, on the date stated below.

11/18/08

Date

Marci M. Sweda

Name



Signature